

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 8-15, 17-21, 23-30, and 32-38 are pending. Claims 1-4, 8-10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 19-21, 24, 25, 30, 33, and 34 have been amended and claims 6, 7, 16, 22, and 31 have been canceled.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

I. The Rejection of Claims 1 and 12.

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 12 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) for being anticipated by the Palviainen patent. Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites “setting up a packet call directed to a first IP address of the called subscriber for forwarding to a second IP address based on a result of said determining.” The Palviainen patent does not disclose these features.

The Palviainen discloses forwarding calls directed to the telephone number of a first mobile terminal to the telephone number of a second mobile terminal. The calls are forwarded through a gateway mobile switching center (GMSC) that is either coupled to public telephone (PSTN) network or a data services network, e.g., ISDN or fax lines. As those skilled in the art can appreciate, the Palviainen patent, therefore, only covers methods for performing call forwarding through circuit-switched telephone networks, not packet-switched networks.

Accordingly, the information used by the visitor mobile switching center (VMSC) to forward calls consists of a terminal number, e.g., a phone number. In contrast, claim 1 covers a method for forwarding packet calls “directed to a first IP address of the called subscriber . . . to a second IP address” based on the results of the determining step. (Emphasis added). The Palviainen patent does not disclose performing a call-forwarding operation based on the IP addresses recited in claim 1. Thus, the Palviainen patent does not anticipate claim 1 or any of its dependent claims.

Applicants further note that while Palviainen discloses performing data transmissions, these data transmissions are fax transmissions performed through a circuit-switched ISDN line. (See column 6, lines 1-2). The fax transmissions are not communicated using a call-forwarding method based on first and second IP addresses as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 and its dependent claims remain allowable over Palviainen in spite of the disclosure at column 6 of this patent.

Claim 12 recites receiving routing information of a called subscriber according to a packet call set-up request, and then paging a mobile handset of the called subscriber. As described above, the Palviainen system does not pertain to packet calls, only circuit-switched calls. In addition to these features, claim 12 recites that when no response is received from the paging step, performing a call-forwarding operation that involves “setting up a packet call directed to a first IP address of the called subscriber and forwarded to a second IP address.” These features

Amdt. dated **May 15, 2007**Reply to Office Action of **December 12, 2006**

are similar to the distinguishing features in claim 1, except in a conditional call-forwarding embodiment. Based on these differences, it is respectfully submitted that claim 12 and its dependent claims are allowable over the Palviainen patent.

II. The Rejection of Claims 21-23 and 30-32.

Claims 21-23 and 30-32 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) for being anticipated by the Andersson patent. Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection for the following reasons.

Claim 21 recites receiving a call directed to a first IP address of a mobile terminal and forwarding the call to a forwarding address of a subscriber of the mobile terminal, wherein the forwarding address is a second IP address different from the first IP address and wherein the second IP address corresponds to a destination different from the mobile terminal of the subscriber. The Andersson patent does not disclose these features.

The Andersson patent discloses transmitting a call between two mobile terminals through different paths of an IP network based on whether the called terminal is roaming or not. Regardless of the path selected, the Andersson patent makes clear that the call is eventually sent to an IP address that corresponds to the called mobile terminal. The call is not forwarded to a second IP address different from the IP address of the called terminal as recited in claim 21.

Moreover, in rejecting claim 23, the Examiner indicated that Andersson does disclose transmitting a call to another mobile terminal. However, this is not the case. The portions of the Andersson patent relied on to reject claim 23, and indeed claim 21, all pertain to whether or not a home mobile network 314a will be bypassed in transmitted the call to the called terminal. Neither these nor any other portions of Andersson disclose the features added by amendment to claim 21.

Based on these differences, it is respectfully submitted that claim 21 and its dependent claims are allowable over Andersson.

Claim 30 has been amended to recite features analogous to those which patentably distinguish claim 21 from the Andersson patent. For example, claim 30 recites a receiving circuit which receives information indicating that a call directed to a first IP address of a mobile terminal has been received, and a control system which forwards the call to a forwarding address of a subscriber of the mobile terminal, wherein the forwarding address is a second IP address different from the first IP address and wherein the second IP address corresponds to a destination different from the mobile terminal of the subscriber.

It is respectfully submitted that the features added by amendment to claim 30 patentably distinguish this claim and its dependent claims from the Andersson patent.

III. The Rejection of Claims 2-20.

Claims 2-20 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) for being obvious in view of a Palviainen-Provost combination. Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection for the following reasons.

A. Claims 2-11

Claims 2-11 depend from claim 1. In order to render these claims obvious, the Provost patent must therefore teach or suggest the features of base claim 1 missing from the Palviainen patent.

The Provost patent discloses transmitting short messages through a serving node coupled to a mobile communication system. This may be accomplished using an IP address associated with the serving node. However, the Provost patent does not teach or suggest a call-forwarding method that sets up a packet call “directed to a first IP address of the called subscriber for forwarding to a second IP address based on a result of said determining” as recited in claim 1. Moreover, the Provost patent is directed to providing prepaid SMS services, not call-forwarding services as is further recited in claim 1.

Based on the foregoing differences, it is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over a Palviainen-Provost combination. Applicants further submit that claims 2-11 recite additional features that are also not taught or suggested by Palviainen and Provost.

For example, claim 2 recites registering the call forwarding service by “adding a parameter having forwarding information including the second IP address to packet service subscriber data transmitted from an HLR to an SGSN when the HLR changes the subscriber information stored in a database of the SGSN.” (Emphasis added). These features are not taught or suggested by Palviainen, as this patent only discloses forwarding a call through a circuit-switched network based on a telephone number.

Claim 4 recites “transmitting from an HLR to a Gateway General Packet Radio Service (GPRS) Service Node (GGSN) first routing information for setting up the packet call directed to the first IP address of the called subscriber and forwarded to the second IP address.” These features are not taught or suggested by Palviainen or Provost.

Claims 8 and 9 recite that the second IP address includes at least one of a previously designated URL address, a certain server address and another mobile station address. These features are not taught or suggested by the Palviainen and Provost patents, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 10 recites that the setting up of claim 1 includes: “transmitting first routing information including forwarding information from a first HLR to a GGSN, said forwarding information including the second IP address;” “checking, in the GGSN, whether the first routing information includes said forwarding information;” and “determining a subscriber identification number corresponding to the second IP address included in said forwarding

information.” These features are not taught or suggested by the Palviainen and Provost patents, whether taken alone or in combination.

Additionally, claim 10 recites “determining a second HLR for setting up the packet call to be forwarded to another mobile station corresponding to the subscriber identification number,” “receiving from the second HLR an address of an SGSN of said another mobile station corresponding to the subscriber identification number,” and “setting up the packet call, forwarded to said another mobile station registered by the called subscriber, according to second routing information including the SGSN address received from the second HLR.” These features are not taught or suggested by the Palviainen and Provost patents, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 11 recites that when setting up the packet call forwarded to another mobile station is impossible according to a result of said checking, the step of “setting up a forwarded packet call by routing the packet call using an internet network according to the received forwarding information.” In rejecting claim 11, the Examiner relied on the disclosure of data transmission through the Palviainen network. However, this transmission takes place through an ISDN line. The features of base claim 1 are therefore not disclosed by Palviainen, nor are the features of claim 11 - routing the packet call using an internet network according to the received forwarding information.

B. Claims 13-20

Claims 13-20 depend from claim 12. In order to render these claims obvious, the Provost patent must therefore teach or suggest the features of base claim 12 missing from the Palviainen patent.

Claim 13 recites registering the call forwarding service by “adding parameter having forwarding information including the second IP address to packet service subscriber data transmitted from an SGSN to a GGSN when subscriber information stored in a database of SGSN is changed by the SGSN.” (Emphasis added) These features are not taught or suggested by the Palviainen and Provost patents, whether taken alone or in combination. That is, while the Provost patent discloses a serving node, it does not teach or suggest adding parameter information that includes a second IP address for transmission to a GGSN subscriber information is changed as recited.

Claim 15 recites that when the called subscriber subscribes to the call forwarding service, “an SGSN transmits to a GGSN information including forwarding information for setting up a packet call directed to the first IP address of the called subscriber and forwarded to the second IP address.” These features are not taught or suggested by the Palviainen and Provost patents, whether taken alone or in combination. That is, while the Provost patent discloses a serving node, it does not teach or suggest that its serving node transmits call-forwarding information to a GGSN based on the first and second addresses recited in claim 15.

Claim 17 recites that “the second IP address includes at least one of a previously designated URL address, a certain server address, and another mobile station address.” These features are not taught or suggested by the Palviainen and Provost patents, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 20 recites “transmitting the second IP address from an SGSN to a GGSN according to a result of the determining” and checking forwarding information from the received information. The Palviainen and Provost patents do not teach or suggest transmitting the second IP address of claim 20. This claim further recites that the forwarded packet call is set up by “routing the packet call using an internet network according to the received second IP address.” These features are also not taught or suggested by Provost or Palviainen.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and

Serial No. 10/614,887

Docket No. SI-0036

Amdt. dated **May 15, 2007**

Reply to Office Action of **December 12, 2006**

please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



Daniel Y. J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186

Samuel W. Ntiros
Registration No. 39, 318

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3777 DYK/SWN/kzw

Date: May 15, 2007

\\Fk4\Documents\2029\2029-033\121000.doc

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610